

III. REMARKS

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

U.S. Patent No. 1,869,365

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 12 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 1,869,365 to G.F. Corduan (“Corduan”). In response, applicants have amended Claim 1 to recite a forward support leg that is pivotably coupled to the bottom portion of a seat cushion proximate a forward portion of the seat cushion. The forward support leg is movable between a stowed position that is generally parallel with a bottom portion of the seat cushion and substantially within the seat cushion, and an extended position generally that is perpendicular to the seat cushion. Support for the amendment may be found, for example, in Fig. 3 of the present application.

A claim is anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102 “only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Corduan fails to disclose a forward support leg that moves to a stowed position substantially within the seat cushion in the manner of amended Claim 1. Instead, the forward support leg “E” of Corduan cited by the examiner stows *externally* to a seat “D,” resting against a lower face of a plate 49 of the seat (see Corduan p. 4, lines 13-19; Figs. 1, 2). Accordingly, applicants submit that Claim 1, as amended, is allowable over Corduan.

Claims 2, 6, 7 and 12 depend ultimately from Claim 1 and each add limitations that further distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. As such, applicants submit that Claims 2, 6, 7 and 12 are also allowable over Corduan. Independent Claim 20 has been amended in a manner similar to Claim 1. Applicant submits that Claim 20, as amended, is allowable over Corduan for the same reasons as those provided above for Claim 1.

U.S. Pat. No. 1,963,509

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 12 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 1,963,509 to M.L. Tinsley (“Tinsley”). As previously indicated, applicants have amended Claim 1 herein to recite a forward support leg that is

pivotably coupled to the bottom portion of a seat cushion proximate a forward portion of the seat cushion. The forward support leg is movable between a stowed position that is generally parallel with a bottom portion of the seat cushion and substantially within the seat cushion, and an extended position generally that is perpendicular to the seat cushion. Tinsley fails to disclose a forward support leg that moves to a stowed position substantially within the seat cushion in the manner of amended Claim 1. Instead, the forward support legs 17, 18 of Tinsley cited by the examiner stows *externally* to the seat 6, resting against side frames 7, 8 of the seat (see Tinsley p. 2, lines 34-42; Figs. 1, 5, 6). Accordingly, applicants submit that Claim 1, as amended, is allowable over Tinsley.

Claims 2, 6, 7 and 12 ultimately depend from Claim 1 and each add limitations that further distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. As such, applicants submit that Claims 2, 6, 7 and 12 are also allowable over Tinsley. Independent Claim 20 has been amended in a manner similar to Claim 1. Applicant submits that Claim 20, as amended, is allowable over Tinsley for the same reasons as those provided above for Claim 1.

U.S. Pat. No. 2,088,644

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 12 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 2,088,644 to J.A. Erpelding et al. (“Erpelding”). As previously indicated, applicants have amended Claim 1 herein to recite a forward support leg that is pivotably coupled to the bottom portion of a seat cushion proximate a forward portion of the seat cushion. The forward support leg is movable between a stowed position that is generally parallel with a bottom portion of the seat cushion and substantially within the seat cushion, and an extended position generally that is perpendicular to the seat cushion. Erpelding fails to disclose a forward support leg that moves to a stowed position substantially within the seat cushion in the manner of amended Claim 1. Instead, the forward support leg 16 of Erpelding cited by the examiner stows *externally* to the seat cushion 32, resting against the bottom of the seat against a seat board 23 (see Erpelding p. 1 col. 1, lines 47-52; p. 2 col. 1, lines 8-26; Figs. 2, 3). Accordingly, applicants submit that Claim 1, as amended, is allowable over Erpelding.

Claims 2, 6, 7 and 12 ultimately depend from Claim 1 and each add limitations that further distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. As such, applicants submit that Claims 2, 6, 7 and 12 are also allowable over Erpelding. Independent Claim 20 has been amended in a manner similar to Claim 1. Applicant submits that Claim 20, as amended, is allowable over Erpelding for the same reasons as those provided above for Claim 1.

JP Pat. No. 61-75028

Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Pat. No. 61-75028 to Taoka (“Taoka”). Applicants have amended Claim 20 herein to recite a forward support leg that is pivotably coupled to the bottom portion of a seat cushion proximate a forward portion of the seat cushion. The forward support leg is movable between a stowed position that is generally parallel with a bottom portion of the seat cushion and substantially within the seat cushion, and an extended position generally that is perpendicular to the seat cushion. Taoka fails to disclose a forward support leg that moves to a stowed position substantially within the seat cushion in the manner of amended Claim 20. Instead, the forward support leg 8 of Taoka cited by the examiner stows *externally* to the seat cushion 5, resting against the bottom of the seat cushion (see Taoka Figs. 1, 2). Accordingly, applicants submit that Claim 20, as amended, is allowable over Taoka.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 8 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 155,107 to J. Richardson (“Richardson”) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,707,103 to Balk (“Balk”).

To establish obviousness of a claimed invention all of the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). As previously indicated, applicants have amended Claim 1 herein to recite a forward support leg that is pivotably coupled to the bottom portion of a seat cushion proximate a forward portion of the seat cushion. The forward support leg is movable between a stowed position that is generally parallel with a bottom portion of the

seat cushion and substantially within the seat cushion, and an extended position generally that is perpendicular to the seat cushion. The combination of Richardson and Balk fails to disclose a forward support leg that moves to a stowed position substantially within the seat cushion in the manner of amended Claim 1. Instead, the forward support legs “D” of Richardson cited by the examiner stow *externally* to the seat member “A,” resting against the bottom of the seat member (see Richardson Figs. 1, 2). Balk provides no disclosure relating to a movable forward support leg and thus fails to provide any structure that could be combined with Richardson to arrive at the invention of applicants’ Claim 1. Accordingly, applicants submit that Claim 1, as amended, is allowable over the combination of Richardson and Balk.

Claims 2-4, 8 and 9 depend ultimately from Claim 1 and each add limitations that further distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. As such, applicants submit that Claims 2-4, 8 and 9 are also allowable over the combination of Richardson and Balk.

Claims 10-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richardson and Balk in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,826,942 to Sutton et al. (“Sutton”). As previously noted, the forward support legs “D” of Richardson cited by the examiner stow *externally* to the seat member “A,” resting against the bottom of the seat member (see Richardson Figs. 1, 2). Balk provides no disclosure relating to a movable forward support leg and thus fails to provide any structure that could be combined with Richardson and Sutton to arrive at the invention of applicants’ Claims 10-15. Nor does Sutton provide any disclosure relating to a movable forward support leg and thus fails to provide any structure that could be combined with Richardson and Balk to arrive at the invention of applicants’ Claims 10-15.

Furthermore, Claims 10-15 depend ultimately from Claim 1. Applicants submit that Claim 1, as amended, is now allowable for the reasons provided above. Claims 10-15 each add limitations that further distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. For the foregoing reasons applicants submit that Claims 10-15 are also allowable over the combination of Richardson, Balk and Sutton.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the reasons discussed above, applicants submit that amended Claims 1-4, 6-15 and 20 of the pending application are patentable over all the prior art of record. It is believed that the application is now in form for allowance and favorable action by the examiner is requested. The examiner is requested to contact applicants' representative at the telephone number below if any other issues remain.

Respectfully Submitted,

/Michael Forhan/

Michael A. Forhan, Reg. No. 46,706

Eley Law Firm Co.

Attorneys at Law

7870 Olentangy River Road

Suite 311

Columbus, Ohio 43235

Telephone (614) 825-3539

Facsimile (614) 825-9590

Email: mforhan@eyleylaw.com